

Applicant(s): Tony Hollings et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/563,639

REMARKS

In response to the final Office action mailed October 8, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. For the reasons set forth below, the application as presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are amended herein. Claims 3 and 21-56 are canceled. Claims 12-14 and 16 were previously canceled. Claims 2, 8-11 and 17-20 were withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-7, 15 and 57 stand pending, of which claim 1 is in independent form.

Summary of Telephonic Interview with Examiner Marini

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Marini for the January 5, 2010 telephonic interview. During the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the patentability of claim 3 over the prior art identified by the Examiner in the Office action. The Examiner agreed that claim 3 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Takahashi and Hoge. As a result, the Examiner suggested that the Applicants submit their arguments in writing.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7, 15, 21, 22 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over Takahashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0037743 A1) in view of Hoge (U.S. Patent No. 5,540,149).

Claim 1 is amended to specify that

“the primary and secondary modules [of the printing unit] each define a path for the paper web extending vertically between the print couples of each pair, the second primary module being positionable in place of the original primary module such that ***the location of web path associated with the original primary module and with the second primary module remains unchanged.***” (Emphasis added.)

The Examiner relies on Hoge for showing the movement of the primary modules as claimed. However, Hoge does not disclose, show or suggest, either alone or in any valid combination, a second primary module that is positioned in place of an original primary

Applicant(s): Tony Hollings et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/563,639

module such that the location of the web path associated with the original primary module and with the second primary module remains unchanged. Hoge teaches that “[t]here is some variation in . . . the height of the web path” when replacing the cassette with cylinders having varying diameters. *See* Hoge, column 5, lines 30-31; FIGS. 5A-5D. This means that a cassette having a different cylinder diameter will have a different web path.

Because no proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 4-7, 15 and 57, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons given for claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the allowance of claims 2, 8-11 and 17-20, which were previously withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, or otherwise has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____ /Keith F. Noe/
Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7039
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: January 7, 2010
Attorney Docket No.: G2017-7001US

999787.1